



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

blessthis creature of salt, that it may become to all who receive it a perfect medicine, abiding in their intestines, in the name of the same our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall come to judge the living and the dead, as well as the world, by fire.—Amen.

The above is a perfectly literal version of this most singular prayer. Our readers may compare it with the original, which we extract from the ritual. Several questions will at once suggest themselves to any thoughtful person perusing the petitions which the Church of Rome thus puts into the mouth of her ministering priest. When, it may well be asked, and how, was this *creature of salt* set apart for the above purposes? Our Lord certainly has said, "salt is good;" but where do we learn that it was created for the protection of the human race? Where, in the word of God, is there the most remote intimation of its being used for religious purposes? What possible meaning is attachable to the prayer that, "as a perfect medicine" it is to make a lodgment in the bowels of the worshippers who receive it sacramentally? (*permanens in visceribus, &c.*) The priest is instructed, after the above words of consecration have been uttered, to insert a small portion of the blessed salt (*modicum salis benedicti*) into the mouth of the infant; and so we must suppose that it is for the benefit of the same infant the prayer just quoted has been offered. Did ever any priest attentively consider such a petition, and then offer it in seriousness?

Our space forbids us to pursue the thread of the petition which follows, into all its mystical windings, or to examine the meaning of such requests as that the infant "who has tasted this his first meal of salt" (*primum pabulum salis gustantem*) should never again hunger (spiritually, it is to be hoped, is meant). We hasten to glance at some of the marvellous performances which follow this saline inauguration.

Next comes the *exorcism*, or rather, indeed, the *double exorcism* with which every infant is visited before the ordinance of baptism is administered (Pages 17 and 19). We have here two most earnest and vehement addresses to the evil spirit, which, it is taken for granted, is discovered dwelling in every such infant. We are almost tempted to give those addresses in their integrity, inasmuch as Romanism has few more curious pieces of liturgical composition. This indwelling spirit is apostrophized as an "unclean," "cursed," "damned devil," and desired to depart. In the form for adult baptism the address waxes "fast and furious." The devil is here roundly rated, with a vengeance. He is addressed as "Satan," "damned," and to "be damned" (*dannate et dannate*). He is further reminded of the torments which impend over him, and desired to be off! The lamentable ignorance which those addresses betray need hardly be commented on. The unclean spirit is, in this last quoted apostrophe (p. 44), addressed as SATAN, and a few lines lower down, the priest who so addresses him is described as *not knowing who he is!* (*quicumque es, spiritus immunde*). While salt and holy water are applied to drive him out of the body of the person to be baptized, infant and adult alike.

Do not such awful perversions of God's holy ordinance of baptism warrant a solemn appeal to those who so abuse it? We know that the bodies of some afflicted ones, in our Lord's human lifetime, and during the apostolic period, were possessed by evil spirits; but on what authority does the Church of Rome venture to assert that the body of every single person to be baptized is so possessed? Do the parents who, in the communion of the Church of Rome, bring their smiling, helpless, and beloved babes to the baptismal font, know the nature of the expressions which the priest is commanded thus to use, in order to drive the devil out of them? Who can recognize in such a ceremony any the least resemblance to the simple and sublime

ceribus eorum, in nomine ejusdem Domini nostri Jesu Christi, qui venturus est judicare vivos et mortuos, et seculum per ignem. Amen.

initiatory ordinance appointed by our Blessed Lord as the means of admission to His Church on earth?

We designedly omit any full account of the remaining rites here enjoined; such as the priests anointing, with his own spittle,* the ears and the nostrils of the infant, while he exclaims, *Ephpheta, Be opened!* With respect to this part of the ceremony, however, we cannot but remark that to us it appears a most blasphemous parody on the miracle of our Blessed Lord to which it refers. Among other minor curiosities of this most curious Roman rite is the placing a lighted candle in the hand of the child or his sponsor (p. 22), and that after the sacerdotal saliva has been applied ("in the odour of sweetness!") with the priestly finger, another digit, the thumb, is used for the application of the holy oil, which is to be laid on the breast, and between the shoulders of the infant, in the form of a cross.

Further, at this particular point of the ceremonial the officiating priest is to doff his violet coloured stole, and don a white one, p. 20. It had been previously enjoined (p. 18) that with the extremity of the same violet stole placed on the infant, it should be introduced within the Church, the preparatory portion of the service having been gone through outside (in the baptistery). We cannot, however, find space for a more ample detail of these singular observances, the entire of which stretch over 58 pages of the ritual, closely printed. Our limits forbid a more lengthened detail. Enough, surely, has been adduced to warrant us in repeating and urging the question, whether any sober-minded person will assert or believe that this adulteration of our Lord's simple institution is in accordance with His will? Is it not manifestly an accommodation of Christianity to the cumbersome and complicated ceremonies and superstitions of Ancient Paganism?

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

All letters meant for publication should be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-street, and the real name and address given, not necessarily for publication, but as a guarantee of good faith.

We earnestly request our correspondents, both Protestants and Roman Catholics, to limit the length of their communications, when possible, and not in any case to discuss a variety of distinct topics in one letter.

To diminish the chance of disappointment, all letters should be forwarded to the office by the first day of the month.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber.

THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN is registered for transmission beyond the United Kingdom.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, AUGUST 19, 1858.

THE true limits of the obedience which sincere Roman Catholics owe to the State, whose protection and privileges they enjoy, is a question of vital importance to the safety and well-being of the community at large.

If we were to form our judgment of the opinions held by Irish Roman Catholics generally, from those promulgated from time to time by the *Tablet* newspaper—the organ of the priests—we fear we could scarcely maintain the position which we honestly put forward in our pages a few months ago, that it was, in our opinion, right that Roman Catholics, as citizens, should stand on an equal footing with Protestants, and have equal opportunities to work out their own position, political and religious, without let or hindrance.

The divided allegiance between the Queen and the Pope, and the superiority of the latter to the former in everything relating to the interests of the Church, directly or indirectly, according to the views of the *Tablet*, would almost lead us to think that even the great object of promoting religious discussion without prejudice or passion may be purchased too dearly, if the views openly

advocated by the *Tablet* shall ever become those of the majority of the Roman Catholic laity of Ireland; and we honestly admit that we do feel a difficulty in defending the position we have assumed in their behalf, when we find Roman Catholics openly maintaining that they are bound, whether as electors or as members of the British Parliament in legislating on secular affairs, to obey the orders of a foreign power, without exercising any judgment of their own in the matter.

The *Tablet*, a few weeks ago, illustrated its principles by the question of Education; but the principles laid down extend much farther. We have to consider how far it is possible to maintain that persons who hold such opinions can be fit to be legislators for a free and independent nation.

It must be admitted that the *Tablet*, at any rate, speaks the general sentiments of the Irish priests, and that it fairly puts forward the principles on which Irish priests try to make Irish electors act.

The *Tablet* thus defines the position of a Roman Catholic in respect of representation in Parliament:—

"A spiritual subject of the Pope, who is represented, so far as he is represented at all, by the Bishops, and not by laymen, though they should happen to be members, and even influential members, of Parliament."

Now, if this be so—if a Roman Catholic, having voted for a member to represent him in Parliament, is to believe that he is not represented by that member, but only by a Bishop appointed at Rome—then we do feel that it is difficult to maintain that such Roman Catholics should have votes. If men are bound by their religion not to be represented by their own representatives, chosen by themselves, it is hard to explain on what grounds they are to be allowed to choose persons to represent them in Parliament.

The *Tablet* thus states the nature of the question to which this maxim will apply:—

"The question is either purely a religious one, or, as almost always happens, a mixed one."

That is, the question almost always involves temporal matters as well as religious matters.

Of such mixed questions, the *Tablet* affirms that these

"Most important practical questions must be considered and decided, but not by lay politicians, if the questions relate directly or indirectly to the Church."

So that if any temporal question relate, even indirectly, "to the Church" (that is, to the interest of the Pope), the Roman Bishops are to "decide" the temporal question as well as the religious question.

Here a nice question arises—and a very practical one, too—in considering whether Roman Catholics are fit to be legislators in a free country. That question is, *who* is to decide for Roman Catholics whether a temporal question is, or is not, indirectly related to the Church? Does the *Tablet* think that Roman Catholics are to decide that for themselves? No: the *Tablet* holds that they must not have a thought nor an opinion on the subject.

The *Tablet* takes its illustration from religious and secular instruction. Secular instruction embraces a wide range: it begins with reading and writing; it extends to engineering, the working of railways, of merchant steamers, of war steamers in the Queen's service; it embraces those studies which prepare for the medical profession, and which qualify men to act as barristers. A system is rapidly growing up which tends to put distinction in all these professions within the reach of the humblest, by their own exertions. The State proposes to open these advantages to all, without interfering with their religious instruction.

But can the State interfere at all in the "secular instruction" which is to fit its own subjects to work its war steamers, its guns, or to serve it

* This superstition was, in fact, introduced when the barefoot practice of complying with the Heathen customs, in order to facilitate the conversion of the Gentiles, had been adopted into the Roman Church. Salt was used by heathen Rome to drive away evil spirits. Water mixed with salt was sprinkled by the priest on the people for the same purpose; this was called a *lustration*. So modern Rome sprinkles them with holy water. A little grain of salt is put into the child's mouth by modern Rome to preserve him from the infernal spirits, as it was used by ancient Rome in their propitiatory offerings to redeem them from the vengeance of the Stygian or Infernal Gods, thus recorded by Ovid:—

"Parva petunt Manes, pietas pro divite grata est Munera; non avidos Styx habet ima Deos. Tegula porrectis satis est velata coronis, Et sparse fruges, parvæque nives salis."

—Fastorum, Lib. 2.

b The form of exorcism, in the case of adult baptism, is as follows: "Satan! thou knowest well that punishment awaits thee, that torments await thee, that the day of judgment impends over thee, the day of everlasting penalty, the day which shall come like a burning oven, on which eternal destruction shall be prepared for thee and for all thy angels. Wherefore, O thou damned, and to be damned, give honour to the living God and the true, give honour to Jesus Christ His Son, give honour to the Holy Spirit, the Paraclete, by whose name and authority I command thee, whoever thou art, O unclean spirit, to leave and depart from this, the servant of God, N—, &c., &c."

"Nec te laetet Satana, imminere tibi poenæ, imminere tibi tormenta, imminere tibi diem judicii, diem supplicii sempiterni, diem qui venturus est velut cibus ardens, in quo tibi atque universis angelis tuis præparatus sempiternus erit interitus. Proinde, dannate atque dannate, da honorem Deo vivo et vero, da honorem Jesu Christo, Filio ejus, da honorem Spiritui Sancto paraceto, in cujus nomine atque virtute præcipio tibi, quicumque es, spiritus immunde, ut exas et recedas ab hoc famulo Dei, N—, &c., &c."

* What is this but a compliance with the old Pagan superstition? Spittle among the ancients was esteemed a charm against all kinds of fascinations. So it was the custom of nurses to purify the child's spitte, and anoint the organs of the face with it on the *Dies lustricus*, the day the child was named.

"frontem atque uda labella Infanti digito, et lustratibus ante salivis Expiat, urentes oculis inhibere perita."

—Persius Sat. 2.

4 The order of spittle anointing is as follows:—"Afterwards let the priest take of the spittle of his mouth, and touch the ears and nostrils of the infant; but when he touches the right ear and the left, let him say, *Ephpheta*, that is, *Be opened*. He then touches the nostrils, saying, in the odour of sweetness (?) But do thou, O Devil, make thy escape, for the judgment of God shall draw near."

"Postea sacerdos digito accipiat de salivæ oris sui, et tangat aures et nases infantis: tangendo vero aurem dextram, et sinistram, dicat: *Ephpheta quod est, Adaperire*, deinde tangit nases, dicens: in odorem suavitatis. Tu autem effugere, diabole, appropinquant enim iudicium Dei."

as army or navy surgeons, or in the administration of its own laws?

That depends upon whether these things are "indirectly" related to the Church!

Can the secular instruction which is to fit the subjects of the State for the social, civil, and military duty of subjects be so far separated from religious instruction, that the State, without interfering with the religious instruction of other persuasions, may provide for the secular instructions of its own subjects?

Are Roman Catholic electors or members of Parliament at liberty to form an opinion on this question about secular instruction? No; they may not. The *Tablet* says—

"The attempt to separate them in accordance with the principle of 'mixed education' has been condemned by the Pope, whom we are bound in consciences to obey."

So no Roman Catholic must venture to think whether any matter is or is not "indirectly" related to the Church: if the Pope says it is, that is enough, and the Roman Catholic has only to obey! If the Bishop of Rome, in Italy, puts his finger on any temporal matter in the administration of the British Empire, and says, "That relates to me," then all Roman Catholics are bound to try to take that temporal administration out of the hands of the Queen, and hand it over to the Pope and his Bishops.

Let no one think that we misrepresent the *Tablet*. The *Tablet* goes farther still, and requires the State itself to submit to this:—

"The State can only, in justice, inquire—not whether the Pope is right or wrong in his decision, but only as to whether he has or has not decided the question."

We ask Roman Catholics not to be displeased with us, and not to suppose that we wish to charge this divided allegiance—this practical treason—on all Roman Catholics. We only want to show them the difficulties which are placed in the way of those Protestants who, for the sake of promoting calm and Christian discussion respecting religion, are anxious to advocate equality of political rights.

Considering the vast importance to individuals, even in the humblest stations, and to the State itself, of the great scheme of education, and of advancement in the public service according to education, to which legislation is now tending, it is a difficulty, even on this point alone, to answer those who ask us, whether persons who hold the slavish doctrines of the *Tablet* are fit to be members of the British legislature.

It is evident that their principles extend to other things also. Important principles of the British constitution, by which liberty is secured to Roman Catholics as well as Protestants, are necessarily at variance with the interests of the Pope. These things, therefore, "relate to the Church." It would, perhaps, be hard to find anything which does not at least "indirectly relate to the Church." All such things, according to the *Tablet*, are to be decided by the Pope and his Bishops and Roman Catholics; electors and members have no right but to obey.

The difficulty is increased when we reflect that the slavish doctrines advocated by the *Tablet* (of which this is but one practical instance) are openly or secretly promoted by Dr. Cullen and a large party of the "spiritual subjects of the Pope" in Ireland.

The difficulty is further increased when we find from Roman Catholic writers themselves that it has been a constant part of the system of the Pope and his "spiritual subjects" to arrogate to themselves the temporal power of all governments, under the pretence that such temporal power is "directly or indirectly related to their religion."

We can only refer here to the remarkable statements of a learned Roman Catholic priest, Dr. O'Connor, respecting the doctrines taught in Ireland in this present century:—

"I have elsewhere shown that some of our Bishops include in their idea of spiritual jurisdiction a power of imprisonment in episcopal dungeons, such as were formerly

annexed to episcopal palaces and seminaries of education. One of our most respectable Archbishops of Dublin alleges texts of Scripture to prove that episcopal jurisdiction implies a power of corporal coercion, by whipping, torture, confinement, and diet; for what else, says he, can be the meaning of the text—*visitabo in virga ferrea*: my visitation shall be with a rod of iron." (Historical Address, p. 96, 97). And Dr. O'Connor concludes, "Until some more rational and Christian ideas of those spiritual jurisdictions are entertained by our exclusive doctors and synods, it is quite nugatory to allege that the oath of allegiance, which disclaims all power, except spiritual, affords sufficient security either to the personal or to the national independence or character of our gentry or clergy, or to the tranquillity of the State." (p. 115).

In reference to this view of "spiritual jurisdiction," we ask our Roman Catholic readers to reflect on the "privileges" claimed for Roman Catholics by the *Tablet*.

"This is a question of education, and it is out of the province of laymen to meddle or make in it in any other way than to claim for themselves THE PRIVILEGE, as members of a tolerated communion, of the absolute control of their pastors."

We presume that in respect of "spiritual jurisdiction," the "privileges" of Roman Catholics are not more extensive.

Granting that those who hold the slavish doctrines of the *Tablet* are unfit to be electors or legislators in a free country; yet, looking back to the history of religious strife in Ireland, and to the origin and effect of penal laws, and to the true interests of calm discussion on religious truth, we are still more anxious to stir up Roman Catholics, by appeals to their reason and consciences, to join with us in crying, "away with such slavish doctrines," than to reimpose political disabilities and penal laws on our Roman Catholic fellow countrymen, on account of the doctrines of their teachers and their organs.

Since writing the above, we have met with rather striking evidence that the religious and political views of the *Tablet* and the priests are rejected by many Irish Roman Catholics. We take the following extracts from the leading article of the *Tablet* of August 7, 1858:—

"We allow that the *Tablet* is odious to British Protestants, and, though we will not say it was unintelligible to the great mass of Irish Roman Catholics, we concede that it was heartily disliked by many, and not to the taste of more. Those who thoroughly agree with its principles or relish its defence of them are few. The want of support in Ireland which the *Tablet* experiences is due to other causes. As to the great mass of the people, it is neither written for nor addressed to them, and among the educated classes, and those who support newspapers, it has far more enemies than friends. . . . The most genuine Irish priests of Ireland are the whole body of our Irish supporters. Of lay support in Ireland we can make no boast; but the vast majority of our 800 Irish supporters are those very Irish priests."

We rejoice at this evidence in support of an opinion which we have long entertained. Still, it is a serious matter that the bulk of the priests are striving to impress on Irish Roman Catholics the doctrines of the *Tablet*. A day may come when the spread of the doctrines of the *Tablet* may again raise the question whether Roman Catholics are fit to be legislators in a free country. We earnestly desire that the minds of all, both Roman Catholics and Protestants, who love peace and charity, should be moved to consider how such an evil can be averted. We request some of our able Roman Catholic correspondents to write on this subject.

To Roman Catholics, and to those Protestants who may think us too "liberal," we wish to throw out this suggestion:—In the absence of all penal laws on Roman Catholics, might not the independence of the British constitution be effectually secured by the maintenance of those laws which were passed in Roman Catholic times, by Roman Catholic Kings and Parliaments, for the defence of the independence of the British crown and nation against the assumptions of the Bishop of Rome.

We believe that Protestants would think those laws sufficient for their purpose; and we think that Roman Catholics might, without scruple, agree to support them.

Correspondence.

WHAT ST. CYPRIAN THOUGHT OF ST. PETER'S AND THE POPE'S SUPREMACY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

MR. EDITOR,—The inevitable consequence of the Pope's supremacy from that of St. Peter is keenly felt by our enemies; and, unawares, they acknowledge it, by their desperate efforts to disparage the latter in every possible or impossible way they can. 1st, in distorting the literal sense of the evangelist. 2nd, in appealing from the living to the dead, in the hope of getting, by this fraud, antiquity to seem to countenance them in their outrage to the word.

I say, by this fraud. For, would not a lawyer, who, for his own or client's interest, explained a will in a sense obviously different from the testator's be accounted guilty of fraud? This actually happened some years ago, in a litigated case, where the testator, a Roman Catholic, bequeathed, in the event of certain contingencies, a large sum "to the Archbishop of D—n." Counsel, availing himself of the unguarded way in which the will was thus worded, endeavoured to defeat what was the evident design of the testator, and to get a decree for "the archbishop," in the parliamentary sense of the title. But the Chancellor, "seeing it to be a fact that the testator was of the Church of Rome, should take the sense agreeably to that fact, and decree accordingly."

From the teaching of the Apostles, the first Christians knew the original or true sense of the text before it was written; this true sense they handed to their posterity, as a sacred deposit; and their posterity, or "the communion of saints," have ever since announced it by a token more unmistakable than is the dead letter in their comments, viz., by their living conduct; by their zeal and fidelity in preserving this communion, and by their horror of schism; which fact is written on the broad face of all ecclesiastical history, from the period of Polycarp's journey from Smyrna to Rome, in the first age, down to that of the Oriental Patriarch's to Florence in the 15th. The members ever moving to the head; but never the head to the members.

Perhaps, it is the consciousness of this fact that makes our adversaries dread to appeal to the living [even as the man of law, in the above instance, would have dreaded to appeal from the parchment to the writer], and prefer the example of Cerinthus to that of St. Irenæus, who condemned the former and all his brood, not by an appeal to Scripture [which Irenæus well knew might be made to say whatever the Reformer pleased], but by the living judgment of the Church, "wherein was preserved by tradition," says Irenæus, "the true sense of Scripture, whereby the faithful, everywhere, were bound to the Church of Rome (or to the See of Peter), propter potentioris principatatem.—Lib. iii. 3.

Before answering objections, it will be necessary to give a summary of St. Cyprian's belief on this vexed subject; for what we have as yet brought from him has been but partial and detached. His words are these: "Seeing there is one baptism, and one Holy Ghost, and one Church founded by Christ upon Peter, for the origin and principle of unity."—Ep. 70, ad episc. Numid.

In his 71st to Quintus—"Peter, whom the Lord had chosen to be chief, and upon whom He built His Church."

In his 73rd to Jubian—"Our Saviour first gave that power of remitting sins to Peter, upon whom He had built His Church, and in whom He instituted and showed the origin of its unity."

In six or seven other places besides he thus insists that St. Peter's person, and not his faith, was the rock on which Christ promised to build His Church.

But how does he suppose the Church built upon St. Peter? As upon its governor. And as all bishops share more or less in this pastoral office, so the Church—that is, the rest of the faithful—are also built upon the episcopal order, and governed by it. For which government the promise made to St. Peter is their commission. It is thus St. Cyprian urges the text, in his 27th letter to the *re-lapsed*, who pretended to be reconciled without the authority of the bishops. "Our Lord," says he, "whose precepts we ought to observe, in the Gospel ordering the honour of a bishop, and the frame of the Church, says to Peter, 'Thou art Peter, and upon that rock I will build my Church,' &c. "From hence through a series of time and successions runs the ordination of bishops, and the frame of the Church; so that the Church is built on bishops, and every act of the Church is governed by them. This being God's ordinance, I wonder that some would write to me with so much boldness, &c." First, then, according to St. Cyprian, Christ built His Church upon the government of St. Peter, as now the rest of the faithful are built on the government of bishops. Secondly, the words of Christ to St. Peter^a prove, according to St. Cyprian, that "the Church is built on bishops, and every act of the Church is governed by them;" that is, to be the foundation of the Church, in the sense of the Gospel, is to have the government of it.

Now, concerning fundamentals, St. Cyprian tells us, "the Novatians had the same creed: that they confessed

^a Matt. xvi. 18.

^b "The Angel of the Church of Smyrna."—Apoc. ii. 8.

^c Or to the Council there, anno 1437.

^d Mat. xvi. 18, 19.

^e Ibid. 18.

^f Epist. 76, ad Magnum.